



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/307,620	307,620 05/07/1999		L. JAMES HWANG	X-409-US	5100
24309	7590	02/19/2004		EXAMINER	
XILINX, I			HONG, STEPHEN S		
ATTN: LEC		ARTMENT	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	SAN JOSE, CA 95124			2178	19
				DATE MAILED: 02/19/2004	12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

#

			-
	Application N .	Applicant(s)	l
Advisory Action	09/307,620	HWANG, L. JAMES	_
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen S. Hong	2178	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears n the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2004 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this (1) a timely filed amendme deal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in	
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or I	p)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the ma			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY V 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	ire later than SIX MONTHS from the VAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH.  The date on which the petition und od of extension and the correspondent of the shortened statutory period office later than three months after	ne mailing date of the final rejection.  IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPE  er 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate ex  ding amount of the fee. The appropriate ex  for reply originally set in the final Office act	EP tension tension ion; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a)  they raise new issues that would require full	rther consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Not		,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	on in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) they present additional claims without cand NOTE:	celing a corresponding num	per of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) work canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted	l in a separate, timely filed amendn	nent
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request application in condition for allowance because:		n considered but does NOT place t	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SC	LELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	/s:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:		,	
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a	pproved or b) disapprov	ed by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure States	nent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	
10. Other:		10,1	

STEPHENS. HONG PRIMARY EXAMINER



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: since the arguments are not persuasive, as the rejection is based on what the references, considered as a whole, taught and suggested. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).